

RECEIVED

By IPA, All Data Verified at 11:42 am, Sep 25, 2008

200315891-5

(translation)

Reference Number: 200315891

Dispatch Number: 536303

Date of Dispatch: September 4, 2008 ✓

NOTICE OF REJECTION

Patent Application Number	2005-018281
Date of Drafting	August 29, 2008
Patent Office Examiner	HIRAI Makoto 9071 5S00
Attorney for Applicant	Hayakawa, Momma & Co. (IPS)
Applicable Article(s)	29-2 (Obviousness), 36 (Indefinite)

This application should be rejected because of the reasons shown below. When you would have opinion against them, please file your opinion within three months from the date of dispatch.

REASON

REASON A:

The inventions according to the claims of this application below should be rejected because of the provision of the patent law article 29-2 (Obviousness). These inventions had been easily achieved by a person skilled in the art before their filing date based on the disclosures of the publications below distributed in Japan or foreign countries or made available for public via electronic communication lines before the filing date.

Remarks (refer to the list of references about the reference etc.) :

[Claims 1-10] Reference 1:

Refer to

- the description from line 15 to line 28 in sixth column of Reference 1 (it is described that classes with same security policy are grouped into same domain, and it is recognized from this description that the domain does not specifically have no relation with privileged class),
- the description from line 40 in ninth column to line 19 in tenth column (there are domain A and B to have call by method M to the domain A be possible, when the method M is in the domain B), and

- the description between line 7 to line 32 in column 7 (each of methods has list for domain that can start up this method).

Configuration for receiving relation between protection type (domain identifier, for example) and code part etc. could have been appropriately worked out by a person skilled in the art to implement the disclosure of Reference 1. The invention according to Claim 1 could have been achieved by a person skilled in the art based on the disclosure of Reference 1.

Specific difference cannot be found regarding Claims 2-9. Note that, it is commonly used to encrypt for security, key is inevitably used for it, and it is no more than a matter of usual to have the key appear in concrete form.

The invention according to Claim 10 could have been achieved by a person skilled in the art based on the disclosure of Reference 1, same as Claim 1.

[Claims 1-10] Reference 2:

They are disclosed in Reference 2 to have protection domain be unit for performing protection, to designate access permission/prohibition to each unit protection domain, to define access permission vector for kernel object that can be accessed from other protection domain, and to assign the protection domain for which access is permitted (right column of page 127 to left column of page 128).

REASON B:

The Claims of this application do not meet the requirement provided in the patent law article 36-6-2 (Indefinite), as described below.

Remarks

1. "enabling" in Claim 1 is not clear, and it is not described in the detailed description of the invention how to enable. This is applied same to Claims 2-9. Note that, "enabling" is not described in Fig. 3A corresponding to (302) and (306) etc. in Claim 1.

2. The subjects of processing in Claim 1 are not clear. This is applied same for Claims 2-9.

3. The meaning of "types of" cannot be understood based on the description of Claim 1. This is applied same for Claims 2-9.

4. The meaning of "portions of code" cannot be understood based on the description of Claim 1.

5. The meaning of "relationship" cannot be understood based on the description of Claim 1.

6. The meaning of "association" cannot be understood based on the description of Claim 1. This is applied same to Claims 2-9.

7. The meaning of "linear" cannot be understood based on the description of Claim 1. This is applied same to Claims 2-9.

8. The meaning of "user definable" in Claim 2 cannot be understood.

9. The meaning of "code are domains" in Claim 3 cannot be understood.

10. The meaning of "based on information describing types of protection" in Claim 10 cannot be understood. Further, "and also" is not clear, it is not clear "what sort of information are meant by "information describing types of protection and also information describing a relationship", and it is not clear what is meant by "based on" them.

List of References:

1. USP 6,546,546
 2. Explanation for Hyper ITRON and mu-TRON 4.0/PX specification, KINDAICHI Tsutomu, Interface, vol. 29, No. 2, JAPAN, CQ Publishing Co., February 1, 2003, p. 122-129
-

Record of Prior Art Search (The result of this prior art search is not a part of the reason of rejection)

-The technical field searched: IPC G06F 21/22, 24

-Prior Art:

3. USP 6,125,447

4. JP 2002-505476 A

5. FURUKAWA Yo, Protection Domain Reduction as a Local Security Support for Open Distributed Systems, Information Processing Society Report, Vol. 98, No. 15, ISPJ SIG Notes, JAPAN, Information Processing Society of Japan, February 26, 1998

(NOTE: all or part of non-patent documents may possibly not provided, because of limitation of law or contract)

When you have question or request for interview regarding this notice of rejection, please contact below.

Patent Examination 4th Division, Information Processing (Information Security): HIRAI Makoto.

TEL 03-3581-1101 (ext. 3546)

FAX 03-3501-0737